

**REMARKS**

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given to this application and for the very helpful interview of September 29, 2010 (summarized below). Reconsideration is now respectfully requested in view of the amendments above and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 8, 24, 26, 28-32, 36, 38-44, 46-48, 50, 51, 62, and 64-66 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 46, and 62 are independent claims. Claims 1, 8, 26, 28-32, 36, 38, 39, 46, 50, and 62 are amended (to make minor wording changes; a minor typographical error was also corrected in Claims 1 and 46). In addition to the claims previously cancelled, Claims 54-59 (previously withdrawn) and 63 are now cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

**Initial Comments**

Applicants previously filed a response to the final Office Action on October 25, 2010, and a Notice of Appeal was filed on November 24, 2010. As noted above, an Advisory Action was mailed on December 7, 2010. The following statement is found in the Advisory Action: “Examiner notes that while applicants response in light of the interview [*sic*] held 9/29/2010 is found to overcome the rejection of the pending claims, Claims 54-59 remain withdrawn from consideration and must be [c]anceled before a [N]otice of Allowance is issued.” Accordingly, in the present paper, Applicants have cancelled Claims 54-59 and have presented the same amendments and arguments presented in the response filed on October 25, 2010.

**Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1, 8, 24, 26-34, 36, 38-44, 46-48, 50, 51, and 63-66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over “Focused Crawling Using Context Graphs,” by Diligenti et al. (“Diligenti et al.”) in view of “Adaptive Information Agents in Distributed Textual Environments,” by Menczer et al. (“Menczer et al.”). (Applicants respectfully note that some of the claims listed in the rejection were previously cancelled.) Claim 63 has been cancelled, thus rendering moot its rejection. This rejection is respectfully traversed (with respect to all pending, non-withdrawn claims) for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites, among other features:

(c) comparing said decomposed components of said objects to said subject specific terminology of the lexicon to determine whether each said object is a subject specific relevant object, wherein said comparing comprises:

(i) assigning a weight to each of said words, terms [[and]] or expressions comprising the subject specific terminology of the lexicon;

(ii) if a said word, term or expression comprising the object matches a corresponding said word, term or expression comprising the subject specific terminology of the lexicon, adding a corresponding weight thereof to a cumulative total; and

(iii) determining any of said objects to be a subject specific relevant object if the cumulative total surpasses a predefined threshold value;

Although of different scopes, independent Claims 46 and 62 recite similar features. The Office Action, e.g., at pages 12-13, cites Diligenti et al. at pages 4-5 as allegedly teaching these features. As discussed during the interview of September 29, 2010 (see summary in Applicants' response filed on October 25, 2010), Applicants note that the cited sections of Diligenti et al. do not teach a "cumulative total," as claimed, nor do they teach comparing such a cumulative total to "a predetermined threshold," as claimed. Furthermore, the Office Action has not provided any reference to Menczer et al. (nor have Applicants found any such teaching) that would address these deficiencies of Diligenti et al. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to present a *prima facie* case for the obviousness of independent Claims 1, 46, and 62, and thus, of their respective dependent claims (all pending claims other than Claim 63, which has been cancelled).

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

**Disclaimer**

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, consideration and allowance are respectfully solicited.

In the event the Examiner believes an interview might serve in any way to advance the prosecution of this application, the undersigned is available at the telephone number noted below.

The Office is authorized to charge any necessary fees to Deposit Account No. 22-0185.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0185, under Order No. 30095-00001-US from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: December 14, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Jeffrey W. Gluck/  
Jeffrey W. Gluck  
Registration No.: 44,457  
CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP  
1875 Eye Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 331-7111  
(202) 572-0322 (Direct Dial)  
(202) 293-6229 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant